

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, August 10, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, the Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., delivered the following prayer:

We rejoice, O God, our heavenly Father, that Thy footsteps may be traced by those who have eyes to see; that the works of Thy hands speak eloquently to those who have ears to hear; that the pulsations of Thy heart may be felt by those who have hearts to feel; that no night of sorrow can obscure Thy presence from those who put their trust in Thee. Once more called upon to mourn the loss of a faithful and valuable Member of this House, we pray that those who knew and loved him, especially those who were bound to him by the ties of kinship, may be comforted by the thought that, his work fulfilled here, Thou hast called him to a larger life of usefulness, and though he may not return to them they shall surely go to him, in Thine own good time, to part no more forever. For this blessed faith and precious hope, we praise Thy holy name, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION COMMISSION.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the Senate concurrent resolution No. 6.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 6 (H. Rept. 142).

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the hearings before the Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation Commission be printed as a public document, and that 3,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation Commission.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the resolution.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think we may as well settle that now. It is a privileged resolution. It is a public document and for a commission of Congress. I think if the gentleman from Illinois will read the resolution he will have no doubt as to its being privileged. It is to make the commission hearings a public document, and calls for the printing of 3,500 additional copies for this congressional commission, a commission composed of Members of the House and the Senate. I have no doubt myself that it is privileged.

Mr. MANN. I have not been able to hear the resolution read in order to get an understanding of it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the resolution. The resolution was again read.

Mr. FINLEY. The cost of this printing, Mr. Speaker, will be \$75.86. That is the estimate of cost furnished by the Government Printing Office.

The SPEAKER. How much?

Mr. FINLEY. Seventy-five dollars and eighty-six cents.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Printing, having had under consideration the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) providing for the printing of copies of hearings before the Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation Commission, reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to.

It is estimated that the cost of printing the copies of the hearings as provided for in this resolution will be \$75.86.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is this the same resolution which was called up yesterday?

Mr. FINLEY. It is.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not insist upon the point of order, although I think it is plainly subject to a point of order. Yesterday when the resolution was called up on the call of committees and reported the gentleman stated that it was privileged. I made the point of order that it was privileged, and the Chair sustained the point of order that it could not be called up if it was privileged without opportunity for the Chair or myself to examine the resolution. Because of that error I shall withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declared it privileged because the gentleman from South Carolina said it was privileged. The Chair did not investigate the matter.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will say that I consulted about as good authority as there is in this country, and he gave me his opinion that it was privileged.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Platt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 7693. An act to authorize the town of Logan, Aitkin County, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in Aitkin County, Minn.;

H. R. 11022. An act to authorize the bridge directors of the Jefferson County bridge district to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River at Pine Bluff, Ark.; and

H. R. 12051. An act for the relief of the city of Crawford, in the State of Nebraska.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 1. A joint resolution to amend certain appropriation acts, approved March 4, 1911.

DRAINAGE SURVEY OF LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House resolution 250. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 250 (H. Rept. 143).

Resolved, That 1,250 copies of House Document No. 27, Sixty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Drainage Survey of Certain Lands in Minnesota," be printed for the use of the House document room.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask that the report be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

August 1, 1911, referred to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FINLEY, from the Committee on Printing, submitted the following report, to accompany House resolution 250:

The Committee on Printing, having had under consideration the House resolution (H. Res. 250) providing for the printing of additional copies of document entitled "Drainage Survey of Certain Lands in Minnesota," reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to with the following amendment, that the words "two thousand copies" be stricken out and the words "one thousand two hundred and fifty" be substituted in their place. The estimated cost for printing 1,250 copies of this document, as provided for in the resolution, will be \$500.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

PROTECTION AGAINST FOREST FIRES.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for five minutes upon the subject of forest fires.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] asks unanimous consent that he may address the House for five minutes on the subject of forest fires. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of California on March 3, 1911, passed the following resolutions:

CHAPTER 35.

Senate joint resolution 8, relative to national forests situated within the State of California and requesting the War Department of the United States to station and maintain Federal troops in such national forests during certain months.

Whereas there are situated within the State of California great national forests, comprising in area over 27,000,000 acres; and

Whereas the protection and preservation of these forests is of great benefit to the citizens of this State and of the whole United States; and Whereas each year during the months of July, August, and September forest fires threaten partial or total destruction of these forests; and

Whereas these forests are not sufficiently protected from fire during such months: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the State of California, and the Assembly, jointly, That the War Department of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to station Federal troops in the national forests within the State of California during the months of July, August, and September each year, for the purpose of preventing and fighting forest fires and protecting such national forests; and be it

Further resolved, That a copy of this joint resolution be sent to the head of the War Department of the United States.

Adopted, March 3, 1911.

On July 5, 1911, I offered the following resolution:

House joint resolution 128, authorizing the War Department of the United States to station and maintain Federal troops in national forests during certain months.

Resolved, etc., That the War Department of the United States be, and it hereby is, authorized to station Federal troops in the national forests within the State of California during the months of July, August, and September each year, for the purpose of preventing and fighting forest fires and protecting such national forests from fire.

I have corresponded with the Department of Agriculture, the Forestry Bureau, and the Department of the Interior in regard to the amount of timber destroyed by fire in the forests, and I find that during the year 1910 there was a loss of \$26,597,228, at a cost of \$1,037,254.03; during the year 1909 there was a loss by

fire of \$456,246, at a cost of \$54,669.83; and during the year 1908 there was a loss by fire of \$1,223,717, at a cost of \$73,283.33. I ask that these tables be inserted in the RECORD, so that they can be used in regard to this matter.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Forest-fire statistics for calendar year 1909.

[Recapitulation by States.]

States.	Class of fires.				Location of origin.			Causes of fires.									Total.
	A.	B.	C.	Total.	On national forest land.	On private land inside forest.	On land outside forest boundary.	Rail-road.	Light-ning.	Incen-diary.	Brush burn-ing.	Camp-ers.	Saw-mills.	Un-known.	Mis-cella-neous.		
Arizona.....	No. 65	No. 33	No. 35	No. 133	No. 127	No. 1	No. 5	No. 9	No. 23	No.	No.	No. 20	No. 6	No. 68	No. 7	No. 133	
Arkansas.....	254	68	69	391	328	37	26	131	3	40	7	21	3	183	3	391	
California.....	161	118	197	476	288	99	89	22	84	17	37	99	14	152	51	476	
Colorado.....	80	30	18	128	81	30	17	69	10	2	9	17	3	12	6	128	
Idaho.....	775	106	110	991	719	65	207	621	79	12	69	84	2	85	39	991	
Kansas.....	4	4	4	12	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	12	
Minnesota.....	63	5	9	77	71	3	3	68	3	1	1	1	4	4	77	77	
Montana.....	221	47	35	303	219	47	37	184	44	1	16	26	3	27	2	303	
Nebraska.....	3	1	4	8	5	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	8	
Nevada.....	3	6	1	10	9	1	1	3	1	1	1	2	3	3	10	10	
New Mexico.....	38	33	58	129	105	11	13	3	12	4	7	50	3	40	10	129	
Oklahoma.....	87	40	73	200	139	22	39	7	15	14	8	49	101	6	200	200	
Oregon.....	49	17	3	69	66	2	1	24	3	2	2	2	2	31	3	69	
South Dakota.....	7	9	1	17	12	2	3	7	1	2	2	2	4	3	17	17	
Utah.....	72	46	46	164	102	25	37	38	6	2	22	43	2	43	8	164	
Washington.....	21	3	4	28	25	1	2	3	1	2	2	15	4	4	3	28	
Wyoming.....																	
Total.....	1,896	568	674	3,138	2,310	346	482	1,186	294	97	181	431	38	758	153	3,138	

States.	National forest lands.									
	Area burned over.			Damage to timber, reproduction, and forage.						
	Timbered.	Open.	Total.	Timber destroyed or damaged.		Reproduction value.	Forage value.	Total value.		
				Amount.	Value.					
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	M ft. b. m.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.		
Arizona.....	20,723	23,574	44,297	3,556	2,207	5,884	140	8,231		
Arkansas.....	34,210	1,356	35,566	3,221	7,974	24,032	55	32,061		
California.....	29,290	56,255	85,545	23,812	45,359	36,943	1,001	83,303		
Colorado.....	260	98	358	193	459	811	18	1,288		
Idaho.....	11,451	4,953	16,404	32,613	25,806	27,175	153	53,134		
Kansas.....	460	3,200	3,660	64	232	700	87	932		
Minnesota.....	1,204	1,664	2,868	6,001	16,893	5,029	18	21,940		
Montana.....	4,021	597	4,618	12	117	3	345	345		
Nebraska.....	13,800	832	14,632	27,561	71,765	20,471	1,356	93,592		
Nevada.....	29	10,532	10,561	13	25	225	50	170		
New Mexico.....	37,066	1,872	38,938	10,885	21,447	12,126	150	33,723		
Oklahoma.....	560	4,926	5,486	443	1,647	2,448	16	4,011		
Oregon.....	7,636	790	8,426	5	10	9	19	28		
South Dakota.....	2,726	143	2,869	27,691	52,962	17,917	1,719	72,598		
Utah.....	5	148	153	228	576	89	1	666		
Washington.....	19,296	6,418	25,714							
Wyoming.....	58	960	1,018							
Total.....	167,791	131,481	299,272	136,298	247,379	153,853	5,118	406,350		

States.	Private lands in national forest.					Cost of fighting fires.				Division of cost according to location.			
	Area burned over.			Damage to timber.		Temporary labor.	Guard and ranger labor.	Tools, supplies, etc.	Total cost.	On national forest land.	On private lands inside forest boundaries.	On lands outside forest boundaries.	Value of co-operation.
	Timbered.	Open.	Total.	Timber destroyed or damaged.									
				Amount.	Value.								
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	M ft. b. m.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.
Arizona.....	960		960	343	875	860.05	637.16	275.22	1,772.43	1,716.93	50.00	5.50	1,138.00
Arkansas.....	9,625	1,955	11,580	457	899	448.96	323.73	2.07	774.76	532.01	165.55	77.20	529.38
California.....	8,667	13,054	21,721	6,833	14,401	10,196.56	3,941.10	3,400.57	17,538.23	12,001.46	2,355.75	3,181.02	6,491.17
Colorado.....	169	35	204	30	72	154.25	201.46	81.02	436.73	330.93	78.68	27.12	337.40
Idaho.....	3,143	1,548	4,691	11,652	9,193	12,531.75	1,570.73	4,671.07	18,773.55	14,328.32	3,415.74	1,029.49	664.58
Minnesota.....	303	280	583	35	115	108.00	207.00	72.00	387.00	337.00	49.00	1.00	666.12
Montana.....	141	15	156	187	632	2,301.85	1,165.22	1,031.52	4,498.59	3,811.71	380.25	326.63	76.40
Nebraska.....						16.00	41.66	28.70	86.36	86.36			10.00
Nevada.....	2,174	105	2,279	393	1,111	1,423.83	1,129.32	1,254.69	3,807.84	3,663.34	135.30	9.20	1,097.38
New Mexico.....						37.50	34.00		71.50	71.50			
Oklahoma.....	6,077	729	6,806	8,391	12,622	2,496.80	1,502.56	1,221.48	5,220.84	2,913.61	1,140.62	1,166.61	664.66
Oregon.....	125	120	245	33	128	1,022.70	288.21	662.40	1,973.31	1,957.56	15.75		325.35
South Dakota.....		13	13				9.28		9.28	9.28			5.00
Utah.....	10,496	3,004	13,500	4,758	9,848	7,643.38	1,958.22	2,109.20	11,710.80	8,177.76	2,754.44	778.60	898.20
Washington.....		1	1			289.60	289.60	262.06	907.86	868.49	29.37	10.00	34.25
Wyoming.....													
Total.....	41,880	20,862	62,742	33,112	49,896	39,597.83	13,329.97	15,072.00	67,999.80	50,836.98	10,550.45	6,612.37	12,937.89

Comparative summaries of the reports on fires on national forests, 1909 and 1908.

	1909	1908
1. Total area burned over (acres).....	362,014	414,638
2. Timbered area burned over (acres).....	209,671	252,382
3. Quantity of timber destroyed (M. ft. b. m.).....	169,410	232,191
4. Value of timber destroyed.....	\$297,275.00	\$451,188.00
5. Damage to reproduction and forage.....	\$158,971.00	\$772,529.00
6. Cost of fire fighting:		
Labor (exclusive of forest officers' salaries).....	\$39,597.83	\$55,981.78
Supplies.....	\$15,072.00	\$17,301.55
Total.....	\$54,669.83	\$73,283.33
7. Class of fires reported:		
Class A.....	41,896	1,436
Class B.....	568	653
Class C.....	674	639
8. Total number of fires reported.....	3,138	2,728
9. Causes of fires:		
Railroad locomotives.....	41,186	603
Lightning.....	294	555
Incendiary.....	97	102
Brush burning.....	151	68
Campers.....	431	493
Sawmills and donkey engines.....	38	5
Unknown.....	758	263
Miscellaneous.....	153	639
Total.....	3,138	2,728
10. National forest area (acres).....	194,505,525	168,000,000
11. Area per 1,000 acres burned over.....	1.86	2.46
12. Per cent of timbered area damaged to total area burned over.....	57.92	60.87
13. Amount of damage per acre burned over.....	\$1.26	\$2.95
14. Per cent of fires of less than 5 acres.....	78.52	76.58

¹ The timbered area burned over in 1908 was not reported. This is an estimate based upon the average number of board feet of timber destroyed per acre in the years 1907 and 1909.

² Seventeen thousand one hundred and sixty-two dollars and eighty-two cents of this amount was expended on account of fires not on national forest lands.

³ Nine thousand and fifty-seven dollars and thirty-three cents of this amount was expended on account of fires not on national forest lands.

⁴ The large increase in 1909 in the number of Class A fires (fires extinguished before causing damage) is entirely attributable to fires on the Coeur d'Alene Forest, for which 657 fires of this class are reported for 1909, as against only 84 for 1908. Locomotive sparks were the origin of 611 of the fires on this forest in 1909, while for 1908 only 9 fires of such origin were reported. Consequently the increase in the total number of fires is almost entirely accounted for by the reports for Coeur d'Alene Forest.

National forest fire statistics, calendar year 1910.

[Recapitulation by States.]

States.	Class of fires.				Location of origin.			Causes of fires.								
	A.	B.	C.	Total.	On national forest land.	On private land inside forest.	On land outside forest boundary.	Rail-road.	Light-ning.	Incen-diary.	Brush burn-ing.	Camp-ers.	Saw-mills.	Un-known.	Miscella-neous.	Total.
Arizona.....	No. 63	No. 39	No. 83	No. 185	No. 174	No. 10	No. 1	No. 13	No. 51	No. 1	No. 2	No. 21	No. 69	No. 28	No. 185	
Arkansas.....	20	66	329	415	303	97	15	8	2	161	13	21	1	207	2	415
California.....	126	101	326	553	319	149	85	11	110	59	29	63	11	204	66	553
Colorado.....	256	70	61	387	303	52	32	246	36	2	8	45	2	38	10	387
Florida.....	8	12	8	28	8	20			1	7	10	4		6		28
Idaho.....	361	96	287	744	526	64	154	189	162	16	76	90	7	161	43	744
Kansas.....		9		9	9				9							9
Michigan.....	13	8		21	4	17		16			1			4		21
Minnesota.....	83	16	34	133	107	14	12	88	2		17	8		18		133
Montana.....	733	121	275	1,129	693	205	231	693	124	10	53	95	9	114	31	1,129
Nebraska.....			3	3	1		2				2			1		3
Nevada.....	7	1		8	8				5	1		2				8
New Mexico.....	91	32	61	184	163	14	7	4	43	1	7	63	1	43	22	184
North Dakota.....		1		1	1				1							1
Oklahoma.....	1	1	1	3	2		1		1		1				1	3
Oregon.....	141	107	247	495	350	70	75	12	74	37	35	144	6	173	14	495
South Dakota.....	39	24	143	206	193	13		143	17		5	5		34	2	206
Utah.....	6	9	11	26	14	2	10	2	5	1	5	7		6		26
Washington.....	307	69	137	513	152	92	269	243	42	4	39	69	13	79	19	513
Wyoming.....	103	23	31	157	137	31	19	31	39	2	4	50	1	27	3	157
Alaska.....	1			1	1							1		1		1
Total.....	2,359	805	2,037	5,201	3,438	850	913	1,704	724	302	307	688	51	1,184	241	5,201

National forest lands.

States.	Area burned over.			Damage to timber, reproduction, and forage.				
	Timbered.	Open.	Total.	Timber destroyed or damaged.		Reproduction value.	Forage value.	Total value.
				Amount.	Value.			
Arizona.....	Acres. 88,060	Acres. 36,088	Acres. 124,148	M ft. b. m. 18,338	Dollars. 19,322	Dollars. 127,054	Dollars. 2,038	Dollars. 148,414
Arkansas.....	260,836	1,075	261,911	11,490	19,128	55,841	23,896	98,865
California.....	152,517	106,196	258,713	116,526	217,726	113,218	1,642	332,586
Colorado.....	2,236	1,194	3,430	4,732	6,629	11,473	53	18,155
Florida.....	10,000		10,000	1,000	500	700		1,200
Idaho.....	1,149,863	509,549	1,719,412	4,021,196	10,186,163	3,139,605	66,315	13,392,173
Kansas.....		640	640				20	20
Michigan.....		1,080	1,080			150		150
Minnesota.....	10,323	11,666	21,989	2,015	10,150	18,100	80	28,300
Montana.....	943,738	81,212	1,024,950	1,613,324	3,649,151	4,984,112	3,086	8,636,356
Nebraska.....	341	109,299	109,640		5,115	11,525		16,640
Nevada.....	3	10	13	2	6	6	1	13
New Mexico.....	23,717	22,924	46,641	1,578	4,120	15,195	371	19,686
North Dakota.....	2		2	2	5			5
Oklahoma.....	200	380	580	10	20	20		40
Oregon.....	187,276	81,423	268,699	564,586	620,990	365,293	3,970	990,213
South Dakota.....	10,637	786	11,423	7,393	22,960	48,504	46	71,510
Utah.....	63	2,002	2,065	89	186	90	32	368
Washington.....	218,258	19,295	237,553	130,667	105,363	173,080	1,048	280,091
Wyoming.....	20,039	11,931	31,970	15,421	27,315	122,766	289	150,370
Total.....	3,078,109	1,056,144	4,134,253	6,508,369	14,889,724	9,180,989	114,382	24,185,095

National forest-fire statistics, calendar year 1910—Continued.

States.	Private lands in national forest.					Cost of fighting fires.				Division of cost according to location.			
	Area burned over.			Damage to timber.		Temporary labor.	Guard and ranger labor.	Tools, supplies, etc.	Total cost.	On national forest land.	On private lands inside forest boundaries.	On lands outside forest boundaries.	Value of co-operation.
	Timbered.	Open.	Total.	Timber destroyed or damaged.									
				Amount.	Value.								
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	M. ft. b. m.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.
Arizona.....	1,766	385	2,151	1,716	1,808	4,806.21	2,020.00	1,551.53	8,377.74	7,809.41	565.00	3.33	1,750.29
Arkansas.....	234,266	5,115	239,381	11,989	19,374	3,456.49	2,014.48	129.60	5,600.57	4,384.39	1,138.17	78.01	2,018.80
California.....	86,358	22,273	108,631	93,420	189,843	40,972.74	10,618.48	17,417.13	69,008.35	53,176.84	10,842.18	4,989.33	28,659.70
Colorado.....	730	100	830	477	918	4,771.27	1,593.24	1,425.99	7,790.50	4,577.90	574.84	2,637.76	2,120.43
Florida.....	200,000		200,000	20,000	10,000	49.35	110.44	38.00	197.79	197.79			18.65
Idaho.....	27,663	14,031	41,694	446,742	1,213,493	220,508.16	39,403.59	125,878.59	385,790.34	313,771.18	17,847.91	54,171.25	30,887.73
Michigan.....		750	750			4.00	4.41		8.41	8.41			304.00
Minnesota.....	18,528	3,093	* 21,621	11,000	60,000	3,398.40	971.65	420.36	4,790.41	2,532.14	2,194.05	64.22	110.00
Montana.....	102,874	8,289	111,163	287,306	686,870	272,387.98	31,285.71	149,487.95	453,161.64	360,558.84	40,601.34	52,001.46	21,328.58
Nebraska.....		5,960	5,960			52.20	16.00		68.20	68.20			176.80
Nevada.....							3.33		3.33	3.33			
New Mexico.....	1,086	685	1,771	417	1,396	1,380.95	925.63	733.79	3,040.37	2,944.99	61.68	33.70	817.00
Oklahoma.....							10.56		10.56	10.56			42.00
Oregon.....	34,797	15,384	50,181	164,433	199,808	67,930.59	13,060.21	36,285.76	117,276.56	87,023.68	13,250.12	16,402.76	9,309.85
South Dakota.....	508	415	923	59	231	22,722.70	1,280.67	4,077.55	28,080.92	27,057.05	114.87	9.00	11,314.20
Utah.....		2,320	2,320			151.65	177.40	68.86	397.91	248.55	48.50	100.86	44.75
Washington.....	18,178	6,230	24,408	18,254	28,058	38,572.75	6,586.76	10,377.83	55,537.34	41,239.42	8,146.73	6,151.19	9,184.09
Wyoming.....	709	425	1,134	108	339	5,971.51	2,778.75	2,209.14	10,959.40	9,947.44	44.51	967.45	3,169.07
Alaska.....							3.33	15.00	18.33	18.33			
Total.....	727,463	85,455	812,918	1,055,921	2,412,133	687,136.95	112,864.64	350,117.08	1,150,118.67	917,078.45	95,429.90	137,610.22	121,247.81

Summaries and analysis of national forest fire reports for 1910 and 1909.

[Private lands within national forest boundaries included.]

	1910		1909	
1. Area of national forests (acres).....	191,250,038		194,505,525	
2. Total area burned over (acres).....	4,947,171		362,014	
3. Area per 1,000 acres burned over.....	25.87		1.86	
4. Timbered area burned over (acres).....	3,805,572		209,671	
5. Timbered area (per cent of total area burned over).....	76.92		57.92	
6. Quantity of timber destroyed or damaged (M. ft. b. m.).....	7,564,290		169,410	
7. Losses by fires:				
In timber.....	\$17,301,857.00		\$297,275.00	
In reproduction and forage.....	\$9,295,371.00		\$158,971.00	
Total.....	\$26,597,228.00		\$456,246.00	
8. Cost of fire fighting:				
Labor (exclusive of forest officers' salaries).....	\$687,136.95		\$39,597.83	
Supplies, etc.....	\$350,117.08		\$15,072.09	
Total.....	\$1,037,254.03		\$54,669.92	
9. Classification of fires:				
Class A (no damages).....	No. 2,359	Perc. 45.36	No. 1,896	Perc. 60.42
Class B (under 5 acres).....	805	15.48	568	18.10
Class C (5 acres and over).....	2,037	39.16	674	21.48
Total number of fires.....	5,201	100.00	3,138	100.00
10. Causes of fires:				
Railroad locomotives.....	1,704	32.76	1,196	37.73
Lightning.....	724	13.92	294	9.37
Incendiary.....	302	5.81	97	3.09
Brush burning.....	307	5.90	181	5.77
Campers.....	688	13.23	431	13.73
Sawmills and donkey engines.....	51	.98	38	1.21
Unknown.....	1,184	22.77	758	24.16
Miscellaneous.....	241	4.63	153	4.88
Total.....	5,201	100.00	3,138	100.00
11. Locality of origin of fires:				
On national forest lands.....	3,438	66.10	2,310	73.61
On private lands within the forests.....	850	16.34	346	11.03
On lands outside of forest boundaries.....	913	17.56	482	15.36
Total.....	5,201	100.00	3,138	100.00

Losses on private lands within forest boundaries.

The amounts given in connection with a, b, c, and d are included in the preceding table after 2, 3, 6, and 7, and the percentages following indicate the ratio of the losses on private lands within the forests to the total losses on the forests, as shown in the first table. However, in this exhibit the cost of fire fighting includes the value of the time of forest officers.

	Amount.	Per cent.	Amount.	Per cent.
a. Area burned over, timbered and open (acres).....	\$12,918	16.43	62,742	17.33
b. Timbered areas destroyed or damaged (acres).....	727,463	19.12	41,880	19.97
c. Quantity of timber destroyed or damaged (M. ft. b. m.).....	1,055,921	13.96	33,112	19.55
d. Damage to timber.....	\$2,412,133.00	13.94	\$49,896.00	16.78
e. Cost of fires on private lands within and outside of forest boundaries.....	\$233,040.22	20.26	\$17,162.82	25.24

During the year 1910 there were a great number of forest fires in California, and yet by the assistance of the soldiers property was protected and millions of dollars were saved. I find on investigation that the War Department has no authority to send out these troops, and this resolution is offered for the purpose of giving it permission to so utilize the men in the

Army. By inquiry at the War Department I find that there are 126 officers and 4,300 enlisted men of the Army now in the State of California that could be used for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I also desire to read a newspaper article from San Bernardino, Cal., under date of August 3, as follows:

SOLDIERS ARE WANTED TO FIGHT FOREST FIRES.

SAN BERNARDINO, August 3.

A frantic appeal for troops to combat the forest fire in the mountains north of here was sent to the War Department to-day. Between 50 and 75 square miles of forest already have been destroyed on the watershed of the San Bernardino Reserve.

Following the admission to-day of Forest Supervisor Charlton that he is unable to cope with the situation, every civic body in this section kept the wires to Washington hot with appeals for aid.

I desire to say that I find the same situation all over the State of California, where large tracts of timber are being destroyed by fire. All the available men of the Department of Agriculture are being used. More help is needed, and this resolution is simply that the War Department be given permission to send these troops out when requested. I hope that before this Congress adjourns we shall be able to pass this resolution, providing that when the Forestry Bureau of the Department of Agriculture requests the War Department to send troops it will have that authority.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. To which one of the two gentlemen does the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield first to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Has the resolution been introduced?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Was it introduced only yesterday?

Mr. RAKER. It was introduced some time ago.

Mr. MANN. Has it been reported?

Mr. RAKER. Not yet.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think it is an emergency matter?

Mr. RAKER. Why, if \$24,000,000 worth of property was destroyed last year, and fires are raging now, and 4,000 men are there that could be used, it seems to me there is not any more urgent matter of business that this Congress could consider than this.

Mr. MANN. Yet under the Democratic caucus action have they not refused to report it to this House?

Mr. RAKER. They have not refused to report it.

Mr. MANN. They have not reported it.

Mr. RAKER. I desire to call it to the attention of Members of this Congress before we adjourn, and I desire to ask unanimous consent that we take it up and pass it without any delay. A vast amount of property is going to waste, and all these men are there at the Presidio, who might be called out and sent over the State of California to preserve millions of dollars' worth of property. These fires are raging right now, and the men are needed to do this work. Congress is in session, and these people are appealing for aid. It seems to me this is the time to act. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I desire to ask unanimous consent that we take up this resolution at this time and pass it.

Mr. BUTLER. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. The regular order is called for.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend remarks in the RECORD at some future date on the subject of the Government coal-land policy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD remarks on the subject of coal lands. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) admitting New Mexico and Arizona to statehood, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, these amendments do not materially alter the resolution as it passed the House.

There are three of them. They all amend the section of the resolution providing for the separate ballot which is to be used in voting upon the constitutional amendment submitted to the voters of New Mexico. The Senate amendments throw additional safeguards around the use of this ballot. They require the ballot, after it has been handed to the voter by the election officer, to be returned to that officer, whether it has been marked or not. The purpose of this is to prevent these ballots from getting into the hands of party workers, who, by getting hold of the ballot, might use it to intimidate timid voters and induce them to vote against their convictions upon this constitutional amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution passed this House by a vote of 214 for it and 58 against it. It passed the Senate by a vote of 53 for it and 18 against it. It is thus demonstrated that this resolution meets with the approval of an overwhelming majority of the membership of both Houses of Congress. [Applause.]

I believe it is satisfactory to the overwhelming majority of the people of both these Territories. I hope the House will concur in these amendments, that this resolution will soon become a law, and that the Democratic and Republican Parties will thereby keep the pledges they have made to the people of these Territories. [Applause.] I hope that these prosperous, populous, and growing Territories may soon be admitted to the sisterhood of States upon equal terms with the other States of this Union. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, if no one desires to speak upon this motion, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Unless a separate vote is demanded on some amendment or amendments, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question being taken, the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The announcement of the result was received with applause.

CALL OF COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The next order of business is the regular call of committees, and the clerk will call them in their order, beginning where the call left off before, with the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to ask if the call does not rest with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state his understanding of the rule, and if any gentleman does not think the Chair's decision is correct the Chair will be willing to hear him. There are two calls of committees under the existing rules that we now have. One of them is the regular call. When the House runs out of any other business to do, then that call takes place. The one we were operating under yesterday is Calendar Wednesday, and when next Calendar Wednesday arrives then the unfinished business will be the bill called up yesterday by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to the opinion that that question came up in the last Congress and the precedent was established the other way; that is, regardless of what day the calendar was called, there could be but one call of committees. I have not looked the question up, but my recollection is that the practice of the House was established that way. My recollection is that the matter was discussed at the time, and it was pointed out that to have a call rest with different committees on different occasions was bound to result in confusion.

Gentlemen raised the question that there was some advantage of having a call rest with the committee on Calendar Wednesday, because it might call up a bill on the House or the Union Calendar, and it had not that advantage on some other day. After discussion, my recollection is, although I may be mistaken, that the practice was fixed that the call should continue day by day; otherwise it would result in interminable confusion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from New York a question. There is no question but that you can have a call of committees any day when the House runs out of business.

Mr. FITZGERALD. None whatever. The only difference that Calendar Wednesday makes is that there must be at least one day in the week when privileged business can not be interjected so as to prevent the call of committees being reached in regular order unless two-thirds of the House so determines. There must be a call of committees on Wednesday in each week,

and there may be a call of committees every day in the week unless matters more highly privileged are called up in the House.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman's contention is that really the two calls of committees are merged in one, and the call rests with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, where we were yesterday.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is my recollection of what was determined by the House. The only thing that was done in the establishment of Calendar Wednesday was that it compelled a call of committees on Wednesday. The rules provided for the call of committees, but a practice had grown up by which business of higher privilege was being continually called up and considered by the House, thus cutting off the call of committees. So, in order to insure the call of committees at least one day in the week, a rule was provided to make it mandatory that the committees should be called one day a week unless two-thirds desired otherwise; but there is nothing in the rule that would indicate that the call of committees on that day should be segregated from the call of committees on any other day in the session. My recollection is that the matter was brought up, and after discussion the House settled that there was no distinction, and that there could be but the one call; and while it might be either an advantage or a disadvantage not to be called on Wednesday, or any other day, that was one of the chances Members and committees had to take.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the decision of the Speaker on the subject. The gentleman from New York, as I understood him, just stated that there was nothing to segregate the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday from an ordinary call on any other day in the week. On the contrary, I call his attention to the rule which specially segregates the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday from an ordinary call.

Paragraph 7 of Rule XXIV, the rule for Calendar Wednesday, says:

On a call of committees under this rule bills may be called up from either the House or the Union Calendar, excepting bills which are privileged under the rules; but bills called up from the Union Calendar shall be considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Now, under the call of committees under the other rule, the ordinary call of committees, Union Calendar bills can not be called, and so it seems to me that while the gentlemen are looking up the precedent set at the last session—which we all seem to be rather hazy about—it seems to me that the letter and the spirit of the rule permitting Union Calendar bills to be called up on Calendar Wednesday is a segregation.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. It is true in the first instance, under the regular order, that bills can not be called up on the Union Calendar, but at the end of 60 minutes they can be.

Mr. MANN. That is true at any time.

Mr. DALZELL. Which is a privileged motion. I say that what the gentleman says about the difference between the two rules growing out of the power to call up bills from the Union Calendar in one case and lack of it in another is not a substantial difference, for the reason that under clause 4 of this rule on any other day than Calendar Wednesday a bill on the Union Calendar may be called up at the end of 60 minutes, which is a privileged motion.

Mr. MANN. That will still be true, of course, if we now proceed to the call of committees as we have proceeded, and as the Chair has held that Union Calendar bills are not in order under a call of committees, at the end of 60 minutes, at the expiration of an hour, under the call of committees, it is then in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of a particular bill, to which one amendment may be offered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. Under the ordinary call of committees a bill on the Union Calendar may not be called up, while under the call on Calendar Wednesday bills on the Union Calendar may be called up. If the ruling is that there is only one call, then this call would rest with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which had under consideration when the House adjourned a bill from the Union Calendar. Query: If it be held that we take up this call to-day where we left off yesterday, can the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on that bill from the Union Calendar and proceed with it?

Mr. DALZELL. I think it can, Mr. Speaker. I think to hold the contrary would get us into this situation: If it be held now

that the bill that was taken up yesterday is not in order under a call of committees, we will take up a new bill, and at the end of 60 minutes it will be in order to move to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and take up the bill that was considered on yesterday. What will be the result? You will have two bills representing unfinished business, one of them the bill that was called up on Calendar Wednesday originally and the other the bill that was called up to-day, so that, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] says, to hold as the Speaker has intimated, will, in my judgment, result in no end of confusion. You will have two classes of unfinished business all of the time.

The SPEAKER. How would it work any confusion?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the Speaker permit me to call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to a method by which it would work perhaps not confusion but interminable delay. Under the ordinary call of committees it is in order, after the expiration of an hour, to move to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on a special bill, but if we proceed now to the consideration of this bill on the Union Calendar and resolve ourselves into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the House will have no way at the end of an hour of taking up any Union Calendar bill except by the committee rising.

Under the gentleman's contention it could not take up any other Union Calendar bill, because it has one before it. The House ought to have the liberty under the rules on ordinary days after the end of an hour on the House Calendar to proceed to the consideration of any Union Calendar bill it desires to reach. That gives liberty to the House, and under the construction the Speaker has intimated it gives the House control of the bill that it chooses to take up, and it will often want to take up some other Union Calendar bill. But if you have to proceed with this bill, if it is the unfinished business, we might have, for instance, the bill that was called up at the last session of Congress for a revision of the judicial title, and the House would find itself in a position where under the rules it could not proceed to the consideration of any other Union Calendar bill until it had completed the consideration of the bill it had commenced on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. DALZELL. That would be a reason why the House should finish the consideration of that bill. There is no answer to what I have said—there will be two kinds of unfinished business.

Mr. MANN. There may be a dozen kinds of unfinished business.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania another question. Now, here is the situation. We on yesterday considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union a bill on the Union Calendar which can not be called up under this ordinary call of the committees. Now, the gentleman from Florida, very much interested in that bill as chairman of that committee, raises this point of order that the call rests where we quit on yesterday. Now, suppose we let the call rest where we quit on yesterday; then under the rule the Chair is compelled to rule that bill out of order to-day, because you can not consider under the ordinary call, as I understand it, a bill on the Union Calendar—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, but after one hour it would be a privileged motion to move to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider a bill on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I wish simply to make this reply in answer to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we would have two classes or two kinds of bills unfinished. Under the old rule we were liable to have that, because under the old rule, after we proceeded for 60 minutes on a bill not on the Union Calendar, a motion was in order and could be made, and we could go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on a bill on the Union Calendar; so we are liable to have the same confusion of which the gentleman speaks now. I do not think that is any reason against the ruling intimated by the Speaker.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to what I have already said that this question was discussed in the last Congress and a ruling made by the Speaker in accordance with the position I have taken to-day.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair would be very slow in overruling a precedent made by a former Speaker if this question had been well settled, but this was a new ruling,

and the Chair has always understood that the gentleman from New York was the author of it, and there never has been but one ruling made on it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a suggestion to the Chair. Under the rule a committee is entitled to two days on call of committees to call up bills and after the second day it can not call up any new bill, but a bill called up on the second day may be continued along from day to day until it is disposed of. One of the reasons for the construction given to the rule was this: If on Calendar Wednesday, for instance, a bill, such as the gentleman from Florida called up, after the committee had occupied practically two entire Wednesdays, was called up at the end of the second Wednesday, and it was a bill on the Union Calendar that would be controverted, on which a large amount of time would be occupied in general debate, and the bill was also one which would require considerable time for consideration under the five-minute rule, in a short session of Congress such a bill as that would occupy every Calendar Wednesday in a short session.

The SPEAKER. Now, that is precisely what did happen at the last session of Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; but the bill that was called up in the manner in which it was called up could have been called up under the rule that had been made on any other day in the week if there had been a call of committees after at least 60 minutes had expired. After the 60 minutes had expired in which business on the House Calendar is considered, it is a privileged motion to move to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider such a bill as the gentleman from Florida desired considered, and it is a motion of such high privilege that a Member can be taken off the floor right in the middle of a speech to have such a motion submitted. It is one of the few motions a gentleman can make in order to get the floor from another.

Mr. GARRETT. If he has a privileged bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Whether it be a privileged bill or not. So long as it is a bill on the Union Calendar, at the expiration of 60 minutes, in consideration of bills under the call of committees, the motion is privileged, and it can take a Member from the floor if offered. It seems to me, while the question, perhaps, was not thrashed out as fully as it might have been, that to have these two separate calls of committees, the call resting one day on one committee and for another day with another committee, will do much to destroy the effectiveness of the rule which was designed to have a call of committees.

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] a question or two. How will it destroy Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to illustrate further than what I have said in this respect. If the ruling be made as now, it is likely to result in one committee occupying the Wednesdays during one session of Congress, to the exclusion of other committees, in the manner indicated.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Was it not held by the House at the last session of Congress that the question of consideration could be raised against one of these Calendar Wednesday bills on any Wednesday when the House determined that enough of time had been occupied for the consideration of the bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is accurate. The trouble about it is this: All bills on the calendar are of some importance to some Members; but there are more Members interested in the great number of bills not under consideration than in any particular bill under consideration, and there are always many Members ready to vote out of the way a bill that is ready for consideration in order to reach other bills on the calendar. Moreover, if there be two calls recognized, both of them may easily rest with the same committee at one time to the exclusion of all other committees.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, with the merits of the present bill I have little concern. I know neither Trojan nor Tyrian as to this bill, but it does seem to me that the question that is raised here goes back to one of the old parliamentary battle fields of this House. There was a decision rendered at the last session by the Speaker, which I believe was the result of great consideration and care, and I think that decision was to the effect that Calendar Wednesday, so far as the consideration of bills is concerned, should correlate with other calls of committees on other days of the week. I do not know whether that ruling states what seems to me and what I shall present to the House as

the great fundamental reason supporting it. If you will go back in the history of the rule relating to the call of committees, you will find that around that call centered a large part of the great obstructive tactics which tied up the business of this House to such an extent 25 and 30 years ago. They had a rule then that any bill called up on the call of committees should be considered for 60 minutes on any one day, should be considered for 60 minutes again on the next call of committees, and then should go to the Calendar of Unfinished Business. The knowledge on the part of the House that any bill, after two days' trial, could be sent to the tomb of the Capulets invited obstruction not only on the particular bill on which they wished to exercise obstruction but it invited obstruction against every other bill on the calendar that was coming in the procession ahead of the particular bill against which they had put their mind.

Now, I invite your attention, Mr. Speaker, to what will happen to-day if you rule that this bill must go over until next Wednesday. I infer from what happened yesterday that there was against this bill a large and determined opposition. They have found, if you shall rule as many here urge you to rule, that by debating that bill until the time of adjournment yesterday they have thrown it over for a week; and next week, when you shall again call it up, they will find that by debating it through that day they can throw it over to another week.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. HINDS. Surely.

Mr. SHERLEY. Would it not be in the committee's power—assuming that the power now rests in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors—would it not be in the power of the committee after the expiration of an hour to call up the very bill that was under discussion yesterday?

Mr. HINDS. It might be, and very likely it would, but the whole experience of this House shows that that process of getting into a committee at the end of an hour and getting out of it again is pretty difficult. The right existed in this House for 10 years, and at the end of 10 years of its use in this House a revolution took place against it which finally resulted in the Calendar Wednesday rule you now have.

Mr. SHERLEY. If you take a large bill like the judicial code, which was under consideration last year, or any large bill such as the one for the reorganization of the postal service, if you take it up on Wednesday and have it as the unfinished business does it not practically block and obstruct every other committee in the House?

Mr. HINDS. I will say to the gentleman, do you gentlemen still remember how last year, when that judiciary bill was in the way, you could raise the question of consideration, and if the majority in this House had assented the Members would have thrown aside that bill when it became an embarrassment? I am not arguing here about the obstruction that majorities may make with their nay votes and vetoes, but I am arguing against that obstruction which puts the power which rightfully belongs to a majority into the hands of a minority.

I will invite your attention a little further, Mr. Speaker, to another point. Suppose two weeks ago it had been known—supposing we were here in the natural order of business—that this bill which is now pending was to come up under conditions whereby the ruling of the Speaker to throw this over for a week would control in this House. You would have had on every bill ahead of it, as every committee was called, that weird, insidious, conscientious, painstaking inquiry after facts which lasts long after the facts have been ascertained. [Laughter.]

You would have had that cushionlike opposition—an opposition more effective than Saladin put before the sword of the Knight of the Leopard—that obstruction which is to-day a national issue, because it exists in another body very far removed from this body—for most of us. [Laughter.] It is for that reason, in order that we may not see restored in this House the old obstruction which reduced this House to impotence 25 years ago, that I hope the Speaker of this House will consider long and carefully before he makes the ruling which he is urged to make to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question before the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] takes his seat?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly, I will yield.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The gentleman from Maine has just stated correctly, according to my recollection, the action taken by the House with reference to Calendar Wednesday bills which continued over from Wednesday to Wednesday—that is,

the question of consideration need not be raised when the bill is first called up, but may on any other Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. HINDS. It may be made when it is first called up, too.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. And on a succeeding Wednesday; and the House, therefore, is in a position at all times, so far as this Calendar Wednesday is concerned, to protect itself against a bill that takes up too much of the time of the House.

Mr. HINDS. It is, if you leave it for the majority of the House to say.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Of course the question of consideration must be determined by the majority. If we call up this bill from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors now, on the regular call of committees, as suggested by the gentleman, then the House could not long protect itself from the consideration of that bill.

Mr. HINDS. It could by the raising of the question of consideration.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The time for the raising of the question of consideration has passed, so far as all bills called up under call of committees is concerned.

Mr. HINDS. I think the gentleman will remember that last session it was ruled that the question of consideration might be raised against unfinished business under the call of committees.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. No; I think the gentleman is in error as to that. It was so held, as I remember it, so far as Calendar Wednesday business was concerned. I made the point. I raised the question of consideration myself.

Mr. MANN. And we voted on it.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. And we voted on it, but it was that that applied only to Calendar Wednesday business.

Mr. HINDS. I think there was no limitation.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. My recollection is as I have stated.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman overlooks the fact that on any day except Calendar Wednesday the question of consideration is taken on a motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, while on Calendar Wednesday the House goes automatically into the committee, and it has been held that every day that is done it is in order to raise the question of consideration.

Mr. MANN. The ordinary way of raising the question of consideration is by raising it in the House, but the ruling that time was that the question of consideration could be raised in the committee, the House having automatically resolved itself into the committee. That could not occur on any day except Calendar Wednesday, or unless the Speaker rules that this bill is in order to-day, when it can be called up as unfinished business.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I have a very distinct recollection that the question of consideration was raised while we were in the House, because the decision was made by the former Speaker of the House.

Mr. MANN. It was raised in the committee.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. It could not have been raised in the committee if the decision was made by the then Speaker.

Mr. HINDS. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if the Chair, following the principles of the decision of the last session, will hold that the call of committees on a Calendar Wednesday is the same call in effect as the call of committees on any day when the House chooses to have a call of committees, he will then remove all difficulty as to the construction which will be caused by the segregation of business in one day and in stated periods.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois will suspend a moment, the Chair will ask the gentleman from Maine a question: Suppose the Chair should rule that the call rests with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, or suppose the House should decide that, then would this bill that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] had up yesterday be in order?

Mr. HINDS. I think so, as unfinished business, as on a call of committees.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and I have not just now agreed as to what the ruling of the Speaker tentatively was. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] insists—and he may be correct—that the Speaker ruled that there were two calls of committees, and that if we went to a call of committees to-day we would commence where we ended yesterday. I was under the impression that the Speaker ruled that under the call of committees to-day it was not in order for the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to call up a Union Calendar bill, and that the bill that was under consideration yesterday would go over as the unfinished business on the next Calendar Wednesday,

and that the call would proceed, and that it still rests with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. The statement of the Chair was a tentative ruling to the effect that in his opinion the rules as they stand now provide for two calls of committees, which have no connection with each other, and that this call to-day would begin with the Committee on Accounts, simply because that is where the regular call was. The committee was called several days ago, and there was no business ready. Of course, that call went clear around the whole circle. That would throw the call back to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MANN. If the Speaker will permit me, then, I think the Speaker is mistaken about that construction of the rule. I understood the Speaker to rule—

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not finally rule at all. He made a tentative ruling for the purpose of inviting discussion about this matter, because it ought to be settled definitely.

Mr. MANN. I understand that the Speaker did not make any ruling. It seems to me that the claim that there are two calls of committees would result in giving some one committee of the House more days than it was entitled to possibly all the season, because the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when I was chairman of it, frequently found itself in a position where it could use up two whole days on House bills. It might do that and have unfinished business, and then use up two whole days on the Union Calendar bills and have unfinished business. It seems to me that the correct construction of the rule—and that was the ruling at the last Congress when the Committee on Indian Affairs and some other committees were cut out of calling up Union Calendar bills because they could not call them up on ordinary days—that when a call has proceeded and a bill on the Union Calendar becomes unfinished business on Calendar Wednesday it is not in order to call it up on the call of committees on another day until after one hour has been used in the call of committees on House Calendar bills.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order, so that we can hear this discussion. The way the Chair rules, or the way the House settles this matter to-day, is very important, because that will be the ruling of the Chair during the remainder of this Congress.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree both with the gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from Illinois that the call to-day rests with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and that there are not two separate calls of the committees. But I disagree with the gentleman from Maine, and I agree with the gentleman from Illinois, that the right under the call of a particular committee is different according as that call occurs on Calendar Wednesday or under the ordinary call of committees on any day.

Under the call of committees, if on Calendar Wednesday, manifestly the call would rest with the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and this bill as unfinished business would be considered, but under the call of that same committee to-day it would not be in order, in my judgment, to call up a bill on the Union Calendar until, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois, 60 minutes had been used in consideration of bills that did not require the House to go into Committee of the Whole. The reason for this view is that otherwise it would give to a committee that happened to get possession of a call on Calendar Wednesday a position of tremendous advantage that I think would serve to obstruct instead of promote the purpose of Calendar Wednesday. The purpose of the rule was not to help a particular committee, but to make easier the getting up of all matters on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question. Suppose the House takes that view of it, or the Chair so rules, it is immaterial which, where does it leave this bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. It leaves this bill as unfinished business on Calendar Wednesday, with this further power in the hands of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that he can now call up House bills, and after an hour, if he has still maintained the floor during that hour, he would have the right to move to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The rule provides that bills from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors are privileged.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not consider that the question of privilege is here involved.

The SPEAKER. That is in the rule, and if that is true, where does it leave the Committee on Rivers and Harbors with this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this is not an appropriation for a river and harbor improvement. If it is, a point of order could have been made against it when it was called up

on the call of committees yesterday. The rule provides that bills that are privileged can not be called up on Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Yes; if the point is raised.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the bill is privileged, then it can be called up any time after the approval of the Journal. A motion would be in order that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HINDS. Whether this bill is privileged or not, I take it, would not figure in this discussion.

The SPEAKER. No; it would not. I was asking for my own satisfaction.

Mr. HINDS. As to the question raised by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], no one appreciates better than I do the logical force of the objection that this Union Calendar bill would not have been in order to-day on a call of committees had the committee been called. But on yesterday this bill passed to a new estate when we adjourned. It passed to the estate of unfinished business. It was, so to speak, naturalized in a new order, a new class, which has always been treated under rules governing that class especially, the rules as to unfinished business. To-day that bill stands before us as unfinished business, and while there is some logical difficulty, yet it seems to me plain that for the orderly transaction of business and for the avoidance of obstruction it would be best for the law of this House if the origin of this bill were forgotten and it were treated only in its present estate, the estate of unfinished business. Under the rules and practice of this House the unfinished business on a call of committees has always been first in order on the renewal of the call of committees.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, the rule creating Calendar Wednesday excludes the consideration of privileged bills. If the gentleman from Maine is right in his interpretation of the rule, suppose under the ordinary call of committees a privileged bill is called up for consideration. Of course the ordinary call of the calendar does not exclude privileged bills. Suppose a privileged bill is called up for consideration and is not finished, then, under the theory of the gentleman, the next Calendar Wednesday we would have to take up that privileged bill as unfinished business, when the rule expressly says that privileged measures shall not be considered on Calendar Wednesday. Would not that be the result?

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, that would be the result, and the gentleman has correctly stated the case, but in the history of this House in the last 10 years I can not remember any case where any Member being in charge of a privileged bill, which is virtually having the ability to send that bill by fast express, has ever wished or ever tried to put that bill into the slow, local accommodation train which this procedure to-day affords.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Suppose the calendar is called on Tuesday, and a privileged bill is considered and not finished, it then may displace all nonprivileged measures on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HINDS. It is conceivable that a high question of privilege like an impeachment—like an election case or any other of those high cases—might be called up on a call of committees. That is conceivable, but any man who has been in this House for the last 15 or 20 years will know this House never does that, and it does not seem to-day that we ought to bring up into argument a state of things which arises from a conceivable case but not from a probable case.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, is not the bill of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] a privileged bill which can be called up by the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. The Chair declines to pass upon that question at present because he has not examined the bill. That question is not involved in this particular matter that is pending here now.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I suggest that the gentleman call up the bill as a privileged bill. I think it is privileged under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The question is simply where the call rests.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to what my distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. HINDS] has stated—and there is no one in this House whose opinion on a matter of parliamentary law has greater weight—the gentleman from Maine, however, suggests that no one would ever use the process suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Suppose some one wanted to cut out Calendar Wednesday, and should happen to have charge of an appropriation bill, and his committee could be reached on the day before Calendar Wednesday. Such a thing might easily happen; and suppose he should call up the appropriation bill on Tuesday. It is the unfinished business at the close of Tuesday, we will say, and, under the contention of the gentleman from Maine, it would

be the unfinished business on Wednesday—on Calendar Wednesday—to be considered during the entire day of Wednesday, and absolutely cut out the ordinary business of Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, I will admit that might be done; but the question of consideration would control and save the House, unless it might be that the majority of the House wished to obstruct; and when the majority of the House wishes to obstruct, all rules and all principles pass into abeyance.

Mr. MANN. Well, not quite, because the rules provide that it takes a two-third vote to dispense with Calendar Wednesday; but, under the procedure suggested, a majority vote could do it, and even then a man who voted would be in the position of voting against the consideration of a great appropriation bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union—

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Florida will withhold that motion, the Chair desires to settle this point of order, and then he will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss this question briefly. It occurs to me that these two paragraphs of Rule XXIV provide for altogether different methods of procedure. Paragraph 4 provides for the call of calendars regularly, but under that procedure the matter called up may be privileged or nonprivileged, provided it is on the House Calendar. The abuse that paragraph 7 was intended to cure was that the calendars of the House became loaded with privileged measures which occupied all the time, and there was no call of the calendar at all and no opportunity to bring up bills under that procedure, and paragraph 7 was adopted as an amendment to the rules generally. That paragraph does not in express terms repeal paragraph 4; it does not refer to it; and if there is a repeal of any part of paragraph 4 it is by implication. Repeal by implication never occurs where the two paragraphs can be construed so that both shall stand. Now, paragraph 7 provides for a call of the calendar on Wednesday, and it includes bills on the House Calendar as well as bills on the Union Calendar. It prohibits, also, the consideration of privileged measures which may be considered under the general call of the calendar under paragraph 4. Paragraph 7 provides for a different procedure and a consideration of a different class of measures. It was designed to bring to the membership of the House an opportunity once in each week to have the committees called regularly for consideration of a certain class of bills, not bills that are in order on the general calendar, but a particular class of bills, and therefore the procedure is of a different character on Calendar Wednesday from what it is under the ordinary call of the calendar. Therefore a bill that is unfinished on Calendar Wednesday is not the unfinished business on the next call of the calendar, but must wait until the next Calendar Wednesday. That is so from the very nature of things, because on Calendar Wednesday may be considered bills which are not in order upon any other call of the calendar.

On the ordinary call of the calendar, aside from Calendar Wednesday, there may be considered bills that are not in order on Calendar Wednesday, so that the ordinary call of the calendar is altogether different and disconnected with Calendar Wednesday. It seems to me that it is a very clear proposition. Each proceeding has its own characteristics, its own functions, and the work of yesterday is not the unfinished business of to-day; the call of yesterday has nothing to do with the call of to-day, because the call of to-day is under an altogether different and independent rule of procedure.

Mr. BUTLER. Where does the call rest?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The call rests where it rested at the last call of the regular calendar, not of Calendar Wednesday, and if there has been no call of the calendar at this session of Congress the call would begin in the order of committees as they appear upon the record.

Mr. DALZELL. The call rests now with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is the Calendar Wednesday call rests there, but we are not doing Calendar Wednesday's business to-day; we are not operating under the Calendar Wednesday rule to-day; we are operating under an altogether different rule, one that will not permit business that may be in order on Calendar Wednesday. We can do to-day business that we can not do on Calendar Wednesday. It seems to me there is hardly any rule of construction that would hold that part of Calendar Wednesday rule should operate to-day, unless all of it should operate.

Mr. DALZELL. But the gentleman must recollect that yesterday the calendar was called and that all the business on the calendar reported by committees and subject to call prior to the report of the bill by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors

was disposed of. Therefore, the call rests to-day with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and if the Committee on Rivers and Harbors can not go on to-day with the bill that they had up yesterday because it comes from the Union Calendar, they have the right to call up a bill from the House Calendar. And the result of that is that a committee under that construction of the rule will be allowed to mortgage two days instead of one. That is to say, for instance, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors calls up to-day a bill from the House Calendar; it has the right to occupy every day of this session devoted to a call of committees until it finishes that bill, except Wednesday, but when next Wednesday comes it has an unfinished bill on the calendar for Wednesday, and it has a right to occupy every Calendar Wednesday until that bill is finished, and that committee under those circumstances has two chances as against every other committee in the House. The rule was never intended to operate in that way.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Just a word in answer to that statement. The call is being made to-day in the same manner as though there were no Calendar Wednesday at all. Calendar Wednesday is a different thing. It is peculiar in its nature. The call, in my judgment, should be as if there were no Calendar Wednesday. There is no connection between the call on Calendar Wednesday and the call of the committees to-day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The arguments brought out by most of the parliamentarians in the House seem to show that they are of one accord on the main proposition. The Chair wished to have the matter settled so that we would not have any more trouble about it during this Congress. Now, they agree practically with the ruling of Speaker CANNON in the last Congress, namely, that the call rests where it left off yesterday, namely, with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and the Chair so rules.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do I understand that we proceed where we left off yesterday?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not call up a bill on the Union Calendar under this call. That is clear to the mind of the Chair, and the rules so state. This call is confined to the House Calendar. Now, if it turns out at the proper time that the gentleman makes a motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider that bill, the Chair might hold the motion to be in order. The Chair will not pass upon the question at this time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is at the end of one hour, is it not?

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to carry the contention beyond the bounds of reason. The Chair states that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] can not call up a bill on the Union Calendar. I ask if this bill is on the Union Calendar or in the Committee of the Whole now?

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. HINDS. That is, the motion which he proposes to make—I could not hear it—is to go into Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman is to go into the Committee of the Whole. However, as a matter of fact, he has not made it.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. He does not intend to make it for an hour.

Mr. HINDS. I will waive that, and perhaps at the end of an hour it will work out all right.

The SPEAKER. The bill that was under consideration yesterday, in the opinion of the Chair, is the unfinished business on next Calendar Wednesday. Now, after the House disposes of any business that it has to do, the Chair, as it appears, would be inclined to rule anybody could get the floor if we had reached a bill on the Union Calendar especially, but at present the call takes up bills on the House Calendar. That is the ruling of the Chair, and the Clerk will proceed with the call of committees.

The Clerk proceeded with the call of committees.

During the call, the following occurred:

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, on the call of the Committee on Agriculture, I wish to take up a bill.

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Agriculture, the Chair will state to the gentleman from Virginia, has been passed.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I was walking down the aisle in order to listen to the call, and I could not hear a call of the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state again that the Committee on Agriculture has been called and passed.

Mr. PEPPER. The Committee on Military Affairs has not been passed as yet, has it?

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GORDON.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that the delegation from the State of Tennessee has learned of the death of Hon. GEORGE W. GORDON, one of our distinguished colleagues.

At a later day I will ask the House to set apart a time to commemorate by proper exercises his life, character, and public services. At this time I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask for present consideration of the same.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 274.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. GEORGE W. GORDON, a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The question was taken, and the resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the following committee on the part of the House:

Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LAMB, Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama, Mr. CRAVENS, Mr. PADGETT, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. HULL, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. SELLS, Mr. PRINCE, Mr. THISTLEWOOD, Mr. TILSON, Mr. KAHN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. SLEMP.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. OLDFIELD, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence indefinitely, on account of the serious illness of his mother.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. DENT, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of the bill for the relief of George P. Heard, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GORDON.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the additional resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, August 11, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant and Chief Clerk for the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to act of March 3, 1909, letter from Acting Chief Signal Officer of the Army, reporting expenditures in connection with the extension of the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system (H. Doc. No. 101), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 13443) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Hornell, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13444) providing for the erection of a public building at Waterloo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13488) to reduce postage on matter of the fourth class and create a rural delivery parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 13489) to provide for increased annual appropriations to the several States for the agricultural colleges established under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and for the demonstration of practical and scientific methods of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 13491) providing that the United States shall in certain cases make compensation for the use of certain public roads of the States for the purpose of transporting free rural delivery mails; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MADISON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 149) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that judges of inferior courts shall hold their offices during a term of 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 150) approving the present project on the part of the State of Illinois, through her agencies, the city of Chicago and the Sanitary District of Chicago, now nearing completion, for the widening, deepening, and otherwise improving the South Branch of the Chicago River to a uniform width of 200 feet, and for the removal of all obstructions therein to a free and easy navigation of said South Branch of the Chicago River, and further declaring the Metropolitan West Side Elevated Railroad bridge, crossing said South Branch of the Chicago River near Van Buren Street in said city of Chicago, an obstruction to navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. POST: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 17) to adjourn present session; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Resolution (H. Res. 275) to pay certain employees for services out of contingent fund; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13445) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Rehberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 13446) for the relief of Amos L. Griffith; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 13447) granting a pension to Frederick M. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 13448) granting a pension to D. W. Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13449) granting a pension to William Onstott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 13450) for the relief of the heirs of Waldo M. Potter, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 13451) granting an increase of pension to Charles Stearns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 13452) for the relief of Fred W. Lamb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 13453) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 13454) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Sams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13455) granting an increase of pension to George W. Branham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 13456) granting a pension to Henry Hempen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 13457) granting an increase of pension to Ruth P. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 13458) granting a pension to Louisa Carson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13459) granting a pension to Edward Dzenogolewski; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13460) granting a pension to Jennie Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13461) granting an increase of pension to Herman Ziegler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13462) granting an increase of pension to Silas A. Boling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13463) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin T. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13464) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13465) granting an increase of pension to Frank Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13466) granting an increase of pension to John P. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13467) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Church; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13468) granting an increase of pension to James De Grote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13469) granting an increase of pension to John Eyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13470) granting an increase of pension to James J. Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13471) granting an increase of pension to Elias W. Folsom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13472) granting an increase of pension to William J. Gorline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13473) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Gregory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13474) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Jamison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13475) granting an increase of pension to John Piper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13476) granting an increase of pension to Martin H. Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13477) granting an increase of pension to James Skanes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13478) granting an increase of pension to George R. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13479) for the relief of Charles F. Held; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13480) for the relief of John H. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13481) for the relief of Emma T. Reid, widow of John B. Reid; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13482) to correct the military record of Edward L. Friday; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 13483) granting an increase of pension to John K. Ricker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13484) for the relief of Charles C. Hartsell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 13485) granting an increase of pension to Stilson E. Willard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 13486) granting an increase of pension to Ann Hickox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 13487) granting an increase of pension to James H. Lile; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13490) granting a pension to Maud Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Petitions and memorials urging the passage of House bill 9449, to amend the Hepburn Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of John B. Kern & Sons and the Milwaukee Millers' Association, protesting against placing flour on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of the Retail Lumber Dealers' Mutual Insurance Association of Wisconsin, indorsing House joint resolution 97; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Ottawa, Ill., for the creation of a department of health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of numerous citizens of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, N. Dak., favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of numerous residents of the Williston land district of North Dakota, asking relief from the public land law acts of 1909 and 1910; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of seven business men and firms of Kulm, N. Dak., opposing a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of citizens of Hawkeye, Iowa, opposing a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition from 16 citizens of Omaha, Nebr., against a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of certain citizens of Port Huron, Mich., asking that an investigation of the management of the Federal prison at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., be made; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution of District Grand Lodge, No. 2, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, relative to the treatment of American citizens of Jewish faith by the Russian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Resolution of District Grand Lodge, No. 2, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, relative to the treatment of American citizens of Jewish faith by the Russian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.